

**LEWIS
AND
ROCA**
— LLP —
LAWYERS

Phoenix Office
40 North Central Avenue
Phoenix, Arizona 85004-4429
Facsimile (602) 262-5747
Telephone (602) 262-5311

ORIGINAL

Tucson Office
One South Church Avenue
Suite 700
Tucson, Arizona 85701-1611
Facsimile (520) 622-3088
Telephone (520) 622-2090

Las Vegas Office
3993 F
Suite 600
Las Vegas, Nevada 89119
Facsimile (702) 949-8398
Telephone (702) 949-8200



0000105446

2002 MAR -1 P 4:13

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION
DOCKETED

Our File Number 39888-00001

March 1, 2002

VIA HAND DELIVERY

The Arizona Corporation Commission
Utilities Division – Docket Control
1200 W. Washington Street
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Re: Arizona Section 271 Proceedings
Docket No: T-00000A-97-0238

Attached are Eschelon Telecom of Arizona's Responses to WorldCom's
First Data Requests.

Very truly yours,

LEWIS AND ROCA LLP

Thomas H. Campbell

THC/bjg
Enclosure

cc: Maureen Scott
Administrative Law Judge Jane Rodda
Ernest Johnson, Director
Service List

Arizona Corporation Commission
DOCKETED

MAR 01 2002

DOCKETED BY	
-------------	--

BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

WILLIAM A. MUNDELL
Chairman

JAMES M. IRVIN
Commissioner

MARC SPITZER
Commissioner

**IN THE MATTER OF U S WEST
COMMUNICATIONS, INC.'S
COMPLIANCE WITH § 271 OF THE
TELECOMMUNICATIONS ACT OF
1996**

)
)
)
)
)
)
)

Docket No. T-00000A-97-0238

**ESCHELON TELECOM OF ARIZONA'S
RESPONSE TO
WORLDCOM, INC.'S FIRST DATA REQUEST**

Eschelon Telecom of Arizona ("Eschelon") submits the following responses to WorldCom's First Data Request:

1. Please indicate whether you had conversations with representatives from Cap Gemini Ernst & Young, including but not limited to Robin Prescott or Debra Prescott, regarding the change management Redesign process during the month of February 2002.

Yes.

2. If so, please describe in detail the substance of the conversations, the participants to the conversations, the date the conversations were held and where the conversations were held.

On or about February 11, 2002, Debra Prescott of Cap Gemini Ernst & Young called Karen Clauson (Director of Interconnection, Eschelon) and left a voice message indicated that Ms. Prescott wanted Ms. Clauson to call her regarding Change Management Process ("CMP") Redesign. Ms. Clauson returned the call the same day. Ms. Prescott asked Ms. Clauson to describe Eschelon's experience with the Redesign process. Ms. Clauson discussed several issues with her, including:

-- Eschelon understands that a process to redesign CMP will be slow and difficult, due to the nature of the task. Individuals who have participated in redesign processes in other regions have indicated that those processes were lengthy and have taken as long as a year or more. This process appears to be on a similar schedule. Although a process such as this may inherently take a long time to complete, the process could be improved by being better organized. Rather than analyzing and dealing with an issue as completely as possible before moving to a new subject matter, pieces of issues are dealt with out of order, so that it is difficult to understand the context or know when an issue has been fully resolved. Rather than work through issues as they arise, "action items" are often created and then dealt with later out of context and on

an isolated basis.¹ While some action items are necessary (for example, to avoid being sidetracked on unrelated issues that the group needs to come back to later), over-use of action items creates an impression of false progress. It appears that a section is complete, when in fact open issues have not been addressed.

-- Often, the toughest questions get set aside. Eschelon has asked that the tough issues be addressed earlier. If the Parties cannot agree, the issue may go to impasse. Delaying the tough issues causes the Core Team to spend time on language that either has to be readdressed again later or may not be used at all, because decisions on the tough issues affect the substance of the affected section of the document. Revisiting an issue several times without either resolving it or reaching impasse creates the potential that issues will not reach impasse when there is still time, in pending proceedings, to obtain resolution of the issues from the commissions. After the time has passed to bring impasse issues in those proceedings, it is less clear how the impasse issues will be resolved, and it may be more difficult and take more resources to obtain decisions on issues.

-- The facilitator spends time independently with Qwest and takes input and direction from Qwest, without taking input from CLECs on the same

¹ The Core Team is currently working off at least three lists of issues: an action item list, a "running" list of issues, and a "gap analysis."

issues. At the last CMP meeting,² Ms. Clauson talked directly with the facilitator about an example of conduct that she believed was intended to inhibit Eschelon's participation and created at least an appearance of bias on the facilitator's part. The facilitator pressed the Parties to discuss and "close" an issue that was not on the agenda and not directly related to the issues that were otherwise being discussed.³ The facilitator told Ms. Clauson that, although the item was not on the agenda set by the Parties at the previous session, the facilitator raised the issue because, since the last session, Teresa Jacobs of Qwest had told her that closing the item was important to Qwest. The facilitator had not contacted the CLECs since the last session to confirm whether they agreed, and the facilitator was not open to discussing the issue at the meeting. Instead, she cut off Ms. Clauson's attempt to raise the issue and said that "we" were going to discuss the item. Ms. Clauson told the facilitator that this conduct conveyed to Eschelon that "we" meant the facilitator and Qwest. Although the agenda will necessarily change at times, the facilitator

² The last CMP meeting before the conversation with Ms. Prescott was the February 5-7, 2002, working session. Eschelon referred to that meeting during the conversation. (There has been another session, since then, on February 19, 2002.)

³ Because Ms. Prescott attended the session, Ms. Clauson did not need to provide all of the details, although she did refer to the facts to remind Ms. Prescott of the situation. She also explained the conversation with the facilitator that occurred on the lunch break. Before the lunch break, the facilitator gave the Parties only a few minutes to review technical terms. Ms. Clauson attempted to point out that review of the terms was not on the agenda, so Ms. Clauson had not had reviewed the terms with any subject matter experts before the meeting and therefore was unprepared to commit to language that day. The facilitator talked over Ms. Clauson in an attempt to cut her off and stated that "this is what we are doing now." When Ms. Clauson continued to object, the facilitator cut her off, saying that "this is what everyone, except Ms. Clauson, is doing now." The review of the technical terms was out of

should have at least listened to her comments as to whether this was one of those times and responded to them before proceeding. This would not have taken any more time from the meeting than the approach used by the facilitator.⁴

-- Despite raising that issue and apparently resolving it, the next day the facilitator again cut off Ms. Clauson when she was attempting to discuss an issue. The facilitator accused Ms. Clauson, during the meeting, of making a "jab" at Qwest. When Ms. Clauson was finally allowed to make her point, however, others said they understood what Ms. Clauson had meant and said it was a valid issue for discussion. Over the lunch break, Ms. Clauson discussed the facilitator's comment with the CMP Director (Judy Schultz). Ms. Clauson said that, if this was to be characterized as a "jab," certainly on other occasions Qwest has made "jabs" at her or other CLEC representatives, and the facilitator has never similarly reproached Qwest. Ms. Clauson also pointed out that, when she was actually allowed to finish her point, others agreed it was a valid point for discussion. The CMP Director said she would talk with the facilitator.⁵

--These are not the only examples of the facilitator, or Qwest, attempting to inhibit discussion by Eschelon during the meetings. Eschelon

context, interrupted an ongoing discussion of another topic, and took time away from other issues that were on the agenda and that were important to Eschelon.

⁴ After Ms. Clauson raised the issue during the break, the agenda item was rescheduled for another meeting.

raises many points during the Re-design meetings because of Eschelon's business interests. Of all the participants, Eschelon actively purchases from Qwest one of the most diverse selection of product types. Eschelon orders from Qwest a wide variety of products, including loops, collocations, a Platform product, resold services, *etc.*⁶ Eschelon uses the IMA-GUI at this time but plans to move to IMA-EDI, so needs to be concerned about the processes concerning both interfaces. Eschelon has also participated actively in the CMP (formerly CICMP) meetings since the early days and therefore has feedback for Redesign that derives from lengthy experience with the process. For all of these reasons, Eschelon has at least as many, and perhaps more, issues to address in Redesign than other parties. Eschelon should not be inhibited from doing so.

-- With respect to Eschelon's long-term experience with CICMP, now CMP, Eschelon believes that the logistics of the meeting have improved substantially since the early days. Initially, the CICMP meetings took place with almost no materials provided to the participants and with subject matter experts rarely involved to answer questions. Many of the improvements in CMP were driven by Eschelon's Lynne Powers (Vice President of Customer Operations), who organized a CLEC Forum and advocated CLEC concerns

⁵ The CMP Director has not communicated back to Eschelon whether that conversation occurred.

⁶ Qwest has indicated that Eschelon is Qwest's second largest CLEC wholesale customer. Eschelon operates in Arizona, Colorado, Minnesota, Oregon, Utah, and Washington.

about the process to Qwest even before the Redesign effort was initiated.

Although some issues arose at the last CMP monthly meeting⁷ regarding logistics, overall the logistics of the CMP monthly meetings are much improved.

-- The master-redlined CMP document has a long ways to go before it will be a usable guide to the CMP process. If one uses the software to "accept" the changes and then attempts to read the document for direction as to the workings of CMP, as would a CLEC new to the process, it becomes clear how much work is needed. Many issues are still open.

Ms. Prescott listened to Eschelon's comments and thanked Ms. Clauson for talking with her about the Redesign process.

After the telephone conversation ended, Ms. Clauson called Ms. Prescott to add:

-- Ms. Powers wanted to ensure that Ms. Prescott understood that, while the logistics of the CMP meetings have improved greatly, the substance of the process still needs improvement. For example, if one reviews the length of time it takes for CLEC-initiated CRs to be worked through the process, the time is too long, and it is much longer than that for Qwest-initiated CRs.⁸ The open issues that the parties have identified in the Redesign process need to be addressed to improve the CMP meetings.

⁷This refers to the CMP monthly meeting before this telephone conversation.

Ms. Prescott listened to Eschelon's comments and thanked Ms. Clauson for talking with her about the Redesign process.

⁸ This refers to both the few CRs that have been submitted (and not withdrawn) by Qwest and the time intervals under Qwest's proposed process for Qwest-initiated CRs.